

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 544

JC 000 387

AUTHOR Cartnal, Ryan; Hagen, Peter F.
TITLE Cuesta College All Staff Survey, Spring 1999.
INSTITUTION Cuesta Coll., San Luis Obispo, CA.
REPORT NO CC-RR-98/99-05
PUB DATE 1999-06-00
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Employee Attitudes; Employees; *Institutional Evaluation; Longitudinal Studies; *Personnel; Personnel Data; Questionnaires; Surveys; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Cuesta College CA

ABSTRACT

The 1999 Cuesta College Faculty and Staff Survey examined ten functional areas: (1) safety/security/campus environment; (2) technology and equipment; (3) organizational structure; (4) college policies; (5) faculty/staff evaluations; (6) planning/decision-making; (7) communications/publications; (8) library/learning resources; (9) support services; and (10) instructional program. The survey was sent to all staff and faculty in spring 1999, with a response rate of 31 percent. The same survey had been administered in 1995, allowing for longitudinal comparisons. Respondents were asked to rate the importance and their satisfaction with each survey item on a five-point Likert scale. Between 1995 and 1999, employee satisfaction increased with respect to 7 to 10 functional areas. Satisfaction decreased with respect to faculty/staff evaluations. Overall, part-time faculty were more satisfied than full-time counterparts. Female respondents ascribed higher levels of importance to college functional areas than did males. In general, length of time employed at the college did not affect satisfaction levels. The main research brief contains 13 tables. Appendices include: (1) a detailed analysis of functional areas; (2) a question by question analysis; and (3) the survey instrument. (RDG)

All Staff Survey -Spring 1999



June 1999

Ryan Cartnal, M.A.

Peter F. Hagen, Ph.D.

Research Report No. 98/99-05

Matriculation and Research Services

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

★ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Martinez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IC000387

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY INCLUDING RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

Background

In 1995 the present survey was administered to all Cuesta staff and faculty - both to meet the requirements of the 1996 accreditation renewal process and to generate baseline data for future longitudinal comparisons. All of the original questions used in 1995 were reemployed in the 1999 survey—thus ensuring meaningful comparisons across time.

Ten functional areas of the college's operating structure were examined by the survey:

- Safety/security/campus environment
- Technology and equipment
- Organizational structure
- College policies
- Faculty/staff evaluations
- Planning/decision-making
- Communications/publications
- Library/learning resources
- Support services
- Instructional program

Respondents

As in 1995, the current year's surveys were sent to all Cuesta employees. The response rates in 1999 were about half that of 1995 (59% vs. 31%). The reasons for this reduction are unclear at this writing. However, the sample size is still adequate for survey purposes.

Methodology

Respondents were asked to rate the **importance**, as well as their current level of **satisfaction** with each survey item on a five-point Likert Scale. Mean "satisfaction" score was computed and then was subtracted from mean "importance" score to produce a **performance gap score** for each question. Comparisons were made between survey years (1995 vs. 1999), between "importance" means, "satisfaction" means, performance gaps, employee campus assignment, employee job category, gender and length of employment at Cuesta.

Report Format

The report employs a top-down presentation format, beginning with an all-staff comparison (1995 vs. 1999) of the *10 college functional areas* as well as a 1999 campus-by-campus breakdown. It then goes on to detail the results by the subgroups noted above. Section 1 of the Appendix provides more detailed information for each functional area measured. Section 2 of the Appendix includes detailed comparative analyses for each individual question grouped under the appropriate college functional area.

Staff Survey Results (1995 vs. 1999)

Comparisons of all staff categories reveal that in 1999, the level of "satisfaction" with each functional area increased from that of 1995 in seven specific instances: *Security / Safety / Campus Environment; Technology and Equipment; College Policies; Organizational Structure; Communications / Publications; Planning / Decision Making; and Support Services*. On the other hand *Library / Learning Resources and Instructional Program* remained constant between surveys. However, the satisfaction level in one area—*Faculty / Staff Evaluation*—decreased between surveys.

Survey Results by Campus (1999)

Now that Cuesta has three campuses, it is important to establish baseline data for future comparisons.

Unfortunately only two (2) people who work predominately at the South County center responded to the survey. Accordingly, any inferences drawn from South County's data are relatively useless.

Table 5 of the report illustrates the perceived performance gaps for the San Luis Obispo campus: *Security / Safety / Campus Environment* was judged most extreme and has a 1.5 unit gap between level of "importance" and level of "satisfaction"—clearly a gap whose magnitude requires further understanding and subsequent action..

The next highest perceived gap area is *Technology and Equipment* at 1.4 units. In 1995, that function's gap was 1.6 units. Clearly staff perceives that Cuesta has made considerable improvement in implementation of increased technology and modernized equipment at the San Luis Obispo campus, however the survey indicates more work needs to be done in this area.

As noted earlier, there is deterioration of perceived satisfaction on the *faculty / staff evaluation* function between 1995 (-0.7 units) and 1999 (-1.0 units). Clearly more work by college personnel is also required here.

The report also shows the results of the staff survey for the new North County campus. These data will act as baseline perceptions for future surveys—currently planned to occur every three years.

Survey Result Differences by Work Status (1999)

An examination of the data by work status demonstrates that, in general, part-time employees (faculty and classified) are more satisfied than full-time employees—both in terms of satisfaction level and in the size of corresponding performance gaps.

Full- vs. Part-Time Faculty

Breakdowns between full- and part-time faculty illustrate that, overall, part-time faculty are also more satisfied than full-time faculty. In the functional areas of *Security / Safety / Campus Environment*; *Technology and Equipment*; and *Faculty / Staff Evaluation*, part-time faculty are significantly (statistically) more satisfied than their full-time counterparts

On the other hand, full-time faculty are significantly more satisfied than part-time faculty in the *Instructional Program* area.

Survey Results by Gender (1999)

Analyses of "satisfaction" levels by gender indicate significant differences in male/female perceptions about Cuesta College's functional areas surveyed. Perhaps most obvious among the differences between sexes is the discrepancy between perceived "importance" levels assigned to each college functional area. Without exception, females ascribe higher levels of "importance" to the college functional areas than do their male counterparts.

As a consequence of the high levels of "importance" assigned by females, the majority of the corresponding performance gaps for females is greater, even though in many cases, females show significantly higher levels of satisfaction than do males—a pattern that closely parallels the findings of the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction* survey whose sample size was nearly 700 adults.

Survey Result Differences Based on Length of Employment at Cuesta (1999)

Employees who have been employed at Cuesta more than three years (but 10 or less years) are significantly more satisfied with *Library / Learning Resources* than employees who have been employed less than three years. The implications of this finding are unclear at this writing. Otherwise, there appear to be no significant differences in perception of the college's functional areas as a result of length of employment at Cuesta.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3

Appendix 1 shows the results of the summations of a number of questions for each college function area.

Appendix 2 shows question-by-question responses for each college functional area. These tables allow the reader to see exactly what each question asked and how each employee group responded to that question.

Appendix 3 includes the survey instrument used to collect the data for this report. The first 69 questions were administered to both staff and faculty. The remaining questions (70-113) were administered only to faculty.

Next Steps

The contents of this report should be considered as "big-picture" snapshots of employee perceptions of the general state of health on the 10 functions surveyed. These snapshots were taken at two points in time: in November, 1995 and again in March, 1999.

As such, this survey does not provide any "answers" *per se*. It merely shows employee perception information. However, it does serve to document levels of employee "satisfaction" and it does document important trend information over time. After reviewing the contents of this report, the interested reader will have many "why" questions—to which there are no answers without further exploration.

Accordingly, the following steps should be considered:

1. Examine the question-by-question results contained in Appendix 2; (pages 13-27);
2. Develop very specific probing questions based on the general questions contained in the survey. These new questions should be designed to probe why, when, how, who, etc.;
3. Convene focus groups to discuss answers to these new probing questions. Focus group composition should be chosen so as to be representative of all relevant segments of the Cuesta stakeholder community;
4. Based on the results of the focus group sessions, develop general procedures / training, etc. to deal with uncovered organizational deficiencies requiring further attention.

RESEARCH BRIEF

BACKGROUND

In 1995, the present survey, although in a slightly different form, was administered to all Cuesta staff and faculty both to meet the requirements of the 1996 accreditation renewal process and to generate baseline data for longitudinal comparisons. All of the original questions used in 1995 were reemployed in the 1999 survey - thus ensuring meaningful comparisons across time.

The results of the two surveys were compared vis-à-vis 10 college functional areas, each of which is comprised of a group of questions that, as a whole, measure each particular functional domain. Additionally, comparisons of 1995 and 1999 data were also made between each individual question.

In an effort to pinpoint which segments of the Cuesta community are satisfied or not, the data were also broken down by employee category, work location, full- or part-time status, gender, and length of employment at Cuesta. Further breakdowns, though possible, were not included, as it was determined that the resultant decreases in sample sizes would severely diminish their utility and generalizeability.

RESPONDENTS

As in 1995, the current year's surveys were sent to all Cuesta employees. The respondent information is presented below in Table 1. Compared to 1995, the response rates in 1999 are disappointing. Nevertheless, the 1999 sample will function adequately as a comparison group.

Table 1: Response Rates for the 1995 and 1999 Surveys

Type of Staff	1995 SURVEY RESPONDENTS			1999 SURVEY RESPONDENTS		
	Surveys Sent	Returned	Response Rate	Surveys Sent	Returned	Response Rate
CLASSIFIED	146	84	57%	194	72	37%
FACULTY	294	153	52%	390	107	27%
MANAGERS	27	26	96%	35	14	40%
ALL STAFF*	467	274	59%	619	193	31%

*The "All Staff" category also includes respondents who either chose not to or inadvertently failed to complete the demographic portion of the survey.

METHODOLOGY

Respondents were asked to rate the **importance**, as well as their current level of **satisfaction** with each survey item. A five-point Likert scale ranging from one to five, where 1 = "Not Important (or Satisfied) at all" and 5 = "Very Important (or Very Satisfied)," was used in order to calculate mean scores for "importance" and "satisfaction" for both the college functional areas and the questions that comprise them. The mean "satisfaction" scores were then subtracted from the **performance gap scores**. Comparisons were made based on the year of the survey (1995 vs. 1999), and by employee category, between the "importance" means, "satisfaction" means and the performance gaps. Moreover, when comparing satisfaction means between years, an independent samples t-test was performed to test the statistical significance of the differences in satisfaction means ($p < .05$). Bold, italicized numbers in the "Mean Change" field of the satisfaction column indicate that the difference in mean satisfaction could have occurred

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

by chance only one time out of 20.

RESULTS

The interpretation of the survey results involves examining three essential components: (i) *Satisfaction Levels*, (ii) *Performance Gaps* and (iii) *the Changes over time within these two measures*. While "importance" levels are interesting as a gauge of what campus personnel hold as significant, they do not—in and of themselves—measure employee satisfaction.

The report employs a top-down presentation, beginning with an all-staff comparison (1995 vs. 1999) of the 10 college functional areas (Tables 2 & 3 below) as well as a 1999 campus-by-campus breakdown (Table 4 next page). Section 1 of the appendix, which follows this research brief, provides more detailed information, including employee breakdowns for the college functional areas. Finally, Section 2 of the appendix includes detailed, comparative analyses of each question grouped under the appropriate college functional area.

ALL STAFF SURVEY RESULTS (1995 VS 1999)

Tables 2 and 3 below provide "satisfaction" and "importance" levels as well as performance gaps for each functional area in 1995 and 1999 respectively¹. The functional areas are displayed from largest to smallest gaps (the signs of the gaps have been reversed to convey the negative connotations of performance gaps).

Table 2: 1995 All Staff Survey Results

Cuesta's Functional Areas	All Staff		
	Imp	Sat	Gap
Technology and Equipment	4.4	2.8	-1.6
Organizational Structure	4.3	2.9	-1.4
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	4.5	3.1	-1.4
College Policies	4.3	3.1	-1.2
Planning / Decision Making	4.2	3.1	-1.1
Communications / Publications	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Library / Learning Resources	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Instructional Program	4.4	3.5	-0.9
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	4.3	3.5	-0.8
Support Services	4.1	3.6	-0.5

Table 3: 1999 All Staff Survey Results

Cuesta's Functional Areas	All Staff		
	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	4.6	3.2	-1.4
Technology and Equipment	4.5	3.3	-1.2
College Policies	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Organizational Structure	4.3	3.2	-1.1
Communications / Publications	4.5	3.5	-1.0
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Planning / Decision Making	4.2	3.2	-1.0
Library / Learning Resources	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Instructional Program	4.3	3.5	-0.8
Support Services	4.2	3.7	-0.5

Comparison of Tables 2 and 3 reveal that in 1999, the level of satisfaction with each functional area increased from that of 1995 in seven specific instances (*Security / Safety / Campus Environment*; *Technology and Equipment*; *College Policies*;

¹ Just as important as the size of the gap, is the trend of the data over time. If gap size is decreasing over time, then progress is being made on that function. However, if gap size is increasing over time, then increased action / resources etc. may be called for. Thus, in a way, this survey can act as a sort of "organizational health" thermometer over time by sampling levels of satisfaction periodically. The current thermometer reading of Cuesta's organizational health then, suggests an overall positive trend between 1995 and 1999.

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

Organizational Structure; Communications / Publications; Planning / Decision Making; and Support Services), remained constant in two (Library / Learning Resources; Instructional Program), and decreased in one (Faculty / Staff Evaluation).

If the performance gaps are examined in isolation, one finds that the performance gaps in 1999 decreased, which indicates positive movement, in five areas (Technology and Equipment; College Policies; Organizational Structure; Planning / Decision Making; and Instructional Program), remained unchanged in four (Security / Safety / Campus Environment; Communications / Publications; Library / Learning Resources; and Support Services), and increased in one case (Faculty / Staff Evaluation).

It may appear counterintuitive that the satisfaction levels increased in seven *functional areas*, whereas the performance gaps decreased in only five. This can be explained however, by examining the 1999 increases in importance ascribed to several functional areas. As a result of the concomitant increases in importance, performance gaps remained constant in some areas.

It should be noted at this juncture that some degree of gap between perceived "importance" and perceived "satisfaction" is normal for surveys such as this one. However, if the gap exceeds 0.5 units, scrutiny should occur. If the gap exceeds 1.0 units, concern should increase sharply.

In sum, it is clear that in 1999 the perceived level of staff satisfaction has increased from that recorded in 1995. The reader should conclude from the above noted information that overall staff satisfaction level is appreciably better than in 1995, except in the one area -- employee evaluation.

SURVEY RESULTS BY CAMPUS (1999)

Now that Cuesta has three campuses, it is important to establish baseline data for future comparisons. In Table 4, results are provided by campus for each *functional area*.

Table 4: Results by Educational Site

Cuesta's Functional Areas	San Luis Obispo				North County				South County*			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap	N	Imp	Sat	Gap	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Organizational Structure	130	4.3	3.2	-1.1	18	4.4	3.1	-1.3	2	4.7	3.6	-1.1
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	128	4.6	3.1	-1.5	19	4.6	3.3	-1.3	2	4.4	3.0	-1.4
Technology and Equipment	130	4.6	3.2	-1.4	16	4.5	3.6	-0.9	2	4.5	3.8	-0.7
College Policies	128	4.4	3.3	-1.1	15	4.5	3.7	-0.8	2	4.0	2.8	-1.2
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	120	4.4	3.4	-1.0	14	4.6	3.7	-0.9	2	4.8	4.0	-0.8
Library / Learning Resources	125	4.4	3.4	-1.0	18	4.3	3.3	-1.0	2	4.0	3.5	-0.5
Communications / Publications	126	4.5	3.6	-0.9	17	4.6	3.5	-1.1	2	4.5	3.7	-0.8
Instructional Program	65	4.4	3.5	-0.9	10	4.5	3.6	-0.9	1	4.5	3.8	-0.7
Planning / Decision Making	125	4.2	3.2	-1.0	19	4.4	3.2	-1.2	2	4.1	3.2	-0.9
Support Services	123	4.2	3.7	-0.5	18	4.4	3.9	-0.5	2	3.9	3.6	-0.3

*Note that South County data include only 2 respondents

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

Unfortunately only two (2) people who work predominantly at the South County center responded to the survey. This may constitute only 20% of the staff who could have responded. Accordingly, any inferences drawn from South County's data should be made with caution.

Table 4 is somewhat difficult to analyze in its present form. Tables 5 and 6 display the same information by rank ordering performance gaps by campus.

Table 5: San Luis Campus (1999)

SAN LUIS OBISPO	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	128	4.6	3.1	-1.5
Technology and Equipment	130	4.6	3.2	-1.4
College Policies	128	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Organizational Structure	130	4.3	3.2	-1.1
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	120	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Library / Learning Resources	125	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Planning / Decision Making	125	4.2	3.2	-1.0
Instructional Program	65	4.4	3.5	-0.9
Communications / Publications	126	4.5	3.6	-0.9
Support Services	123	4.2	3.7	-0.5

Table 6: North County Campus (1999)

NORTH COUNTY	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	18	4.4	3.1	-1.3
Technology and Equipment	19	4.6	3.3	-1.3
Communications / Publications	19	4.4	3.2	-1.2
Planning / Decision Making	17	4.6	3.5	-1.1
Library / Learning Resources	18	4.3	3.3	-1.0
College Policies	16	4.5	3.6	-0.9
Instructional Program	10	4.5	3.6	-0.9
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	14	4.6	3.7	-0.9
Organizational Structure	15	4.5	3.7	-0.8
Support Services	18	4.4	3.9	-0.5

Table 5 illustrates the perceived performance gaps for the San Luis campus. Note that *Security / Safety / Campus Environment* is judged to have a 1.5 unit gap between level of "importance" and level of "satisfaction"—clearly a gap whose magnitude requires further attention².

The next highest perceived gap area is *Technology and Equipment* at 1.4 units. In 1995, that function's gap was 1.6 units. Clearly staff perceives that Cuesta has made considerable improvement in implementation of increased technology and modernized equipment at the San Luis Obispo campus. The remainder of Table 5 (in conjunction with Table 2) is interpreted in a similar manner.

One final note on Table 5 (and 2) concerns *Faculty / Staff / Evaluations*. As noted earlier, there is deterioration of perceived performance with this dimension/function between 1995 (-0.7 units) and 1999 (-1.0 units). Clearly more work by college personnel is required here.

Table 6 shows the results of the staff survey for the new North County campus. As such, it is currently impossible to draw comparisons. However, these data will act as baseline perceptions for future surveys – currently planned to occur every

² However, it should be recalled that when this survey was conducted (March 1999) considerable apprehension existed within San Luis Obispo County for one's individual personal safety. To some unknown extent, this apprehension most likely colored employees' perceived level of satisfaction on the Security / Safety dimension. This is somewhat borne out by looking at the 1995 data (when no such countywide problem existed). In 1995, the perceived level of importance was 0.1 unit lower (i.e., 4.5 units) than in 1999 (i.e., 4.6 units).

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

three years. The data do give the North County staff and administration current indications of which organizational functions are on the minds of employees.

SURVEY RESULT DIFFERENCES BY WORK STATUS (1999)

An examination of the data by work status demonstrates that, in general, part-time employees are more satisfied than full-time employees are both in terms of satisfaction level and in the size of corresponding performance gaps. In seven of 10 functional areas, the full-time employees demonstrated higher performance gaps (Tables 7 and 8 below) than did part-time employees. Moreover, in two functional areas (*Technology and Equipment* and *Faculty / Staff Evaluation*), part-time employees were significantly (statistically) more satisfied than full-time employees.

Table 7: Full-Time Employees

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Full-Time			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	105	4.6	3.1	-1.5
Technology and Equipment*	103	4.6	3.2	-1.4
Organizational Structure	102	4.4	3.2	-1.2
College Policies	104	4.5	3.3	-1.2
Faculty / Staff Evaluation*	106	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Instructional Program	62	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Planning / Decision Making	105	4.2	3.2	-1.0
Library / Learning Resources	102	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Communications / Publications	103	4.5	3.6	-0.9
Support Services	103	4.3	3.7	-0.6

Table 8: Part-Time Employees

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Part-Time			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	45	4.6	3.2	-1.4
Technology and Equipment*	48	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Library / Learning Resources	42	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Instructional Program	33	4.3	3.2	-1.1
College Policies	46	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Organizational Structure	42	4.2	3.2	-1.0
Communications / Publications	45	4.4	3.5	-0.9
Planning / Decision Making	46	4.1	3.2	-0.9
Faculty / Staff Evaluation*	44	4.3	3.6	-0.7
Support Services	48	4.1	3.7	-0.4

*Difference in satisfaction is statistically significant at least at the .05 level

FULL VS PART-TIME FACULTY

Further breakdowns between full- and part-time faculty illustrate that, overall, part-time faculty was also more satisfied than full-time faculty (Tables 9 and 10 next page). In the functional areas of *Security / Safety / Campus Environment*; *Technology and Equipment*; and *Faculty / Staff Evaluation*, part-time faculty was significantly (statistically) more satisfied than their full-time counterparts. Additionally, full-time faculty had higher performance gaps than part-time faculty in six functional areas: *Security / Safety / Campus Environment*; *Technology and Equipment*; *Communications / Publications*; *Planning / Decision Making*; *Faculty / Staff Evaluation*; and *Organizational Structure*.

On the other hand, full-time faculty was significantly more satisfied than part-time faculty in the functional area of *Instructional Program*.

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)**TABLE 9: Full-Time Faculty**

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Full-Time Faculty			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	45	4.6	3.0	-1.6
Technology and Equipment	43	4.6	3.0	-1.6
Planning / Decision Making	47	4.3	3.1	-1.2
College Policies	45	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Organizational Structure	41	4.2	3.1	-1.1
Communications / Publications	47	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	47	4.3	3.3	-1.0
Library / Learning Resources	43	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Instructional Program	46	4.4	3.6	-0.8
Support Services	46	4.3	3.7	-0.6

TABLE 10: Part-Time Faculty

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Part-Time Faculty			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	28	4.5	3.3	-1.2
College Policies	27	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Library / Learning Resources	25	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Technology and Equipment	29	4.4	3.4	-1.0
Communications / Publications	26	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Instructional Program	25	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Organizational Structure	29	4.1	3.3	-0.8
Planning / Decision Making	29	4	3.2	-0.8
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	24	4.2	3.6	-0.6
Support Services	27	4.1	3.5	-0.6

SURVEY RESULTS BY GENDER (1999)

Analyses of "satisfaction" levels by gender (Tables 11 and 12 below) exhibit significant differences in Male/Female perceptions. Perhaps most obvious among the differences between sexes is the discrepancy between perceived "importance" levels assigned to each college functional area. Without exception, females ascribe higher levels of "importance" to the college functional areas than did their male counterparts.

Table 11: Survey Results by Gender

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Female			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	97	4.7	3.1	-1.6
Technology and Equipment	95	4.6	3.3	-1.3
Instructional Program	97	4.5	3.2	-1.3
Organizational Structure*	97	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Faculty / Staff Evaluation*	98	4.4	3.3	-1.1
College Policies	94	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Library / Learning Resources	99	4.5	3.4	-1.1
Planning / Decision Making*	98	4.2	3.2	-1.0
Communications / Publications*	98	4.6	3.6	-1.0
Support Services	97	4.3	3.7	-0.6

Table 12: Survey Results by Gender

Cuesta's Functional Areas	Male			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
Technology and Equipment	42	4.5	3.2	-1.3
Organizational Structure*	41	4.2	3.0	-1.2
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	45	4.4	3.2	-1.2
College Policies	42	4.3	3.3	-1.0
Communications / Publications*	42	4.3	3.3	-1.0
Planning / Decision Making*	44	4.1	3.1	-1.0
Instructional Program	43	4.2	3.3	-0.9
Faculty / Staff Evaluation*	41	4.2	3.6	-0.6
Library / Learning Resources	40	4.0	3.5	-0.5
Support Services	41	4.2	3.7	-0.5

*Difference in satisfaction is statistically significant at least at the .05 level

As a consequence of the high levels of importance assigned by females, the majority of the corresponding performance gaps for females was greater, even though in many cases females, paradoxically, showed significantly higher levels of satisfaction than did males – a pattern that closely parallels the findings of the Noel-Levitz **Student** Satisfaction survey whose sample size was nearly 700 adults.

Further, tests of statistical significance (independent sample t-test) were performed between mean "satisfaction" levels. In three cases, females were significantly (statistically) more satisfied than males (*Organizational Structure; Communications / Publications; and Planning / Decision-Making*).

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

Conversely, males were significantly (statistically) more satisfied than females in one area (*Faculty / Staff Evaluations*).

SURVEY RESULT DIFFERENCES BASED ON LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT AT CUESTA (1999)

Lastly, survey results were examined for differences in perception as a function of length of employment at Cuesta College. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and appropriate *post hoc* tests were performed in order to examine possible differences in satisfaction levels between three categories of length of employment at Cuesta. The ANOVA was significant in only one case (*Library / Learning Resources*) indicating there is a difference in perception regarding adequacy of *Library and Learning Resources*. *Post Hoc* tests confirm that those employees who have been employed at Cuesta more than three years (and less than or equal to 10 years) were significantly more satisfied with *Library / Learning Resources* than employees who have been employed less than or equal to three years (Table 13).

The implications of this finding are unclear at this time. Otherwise, there appear to be no significant differences in perception of the college's functional areas as a result of length of employment at Cuesta.

Table 13: Length of Employment at Cuesta

Cuesta's Functional Areas	<=3 years				>3 & <=10 years				>10 years			
	N	Imp	Sat	Gap	N	Imp	Sat	Gap	N	Imp	Sat	Gap
College Policies	35	4.4	3.4	-1.0	50	4.5	3.2	-1.3	55	4.4	3.3	-1.1
Communications / Publications	36	4.4	3.5	-0.9	52	4.5	3.6	-0.9	57	4.5	3.5	-1.0
Faculty / Staff Evaluation	38	4.3	3.4	-0.9	49	4.5	3.3	-1.2	53	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Instructional Program	24	4.4	3.2	-1.2	32	4.5	3.3	-1.2	34	4.3	3.2	-1.1
Library / Learning Resources*	34	4.6	3.3	-1.3	53	4.3	3.6	-0.7	54	4.3	3.4	-0.9
Organizational Structure	36	4.3	3.3	-1.0	50	4.3	3.3	-1.0	56	4.3	3.1	-1.2
Planning / Decision Making	35	4.2	3.1	-1.1	52	4.2	3.2	-1.0	58	4.3	3.2	-1.1
Security / Safety / Campus Environment	35	4.6	3.2	-1.4	52	4.7	3.1	-1.6	58	4.6	3.1	-1.5
Support Services	36	4.2	3.7	-0.5	53	4.3	3.7	-0.6	59	4.2	3.6	-0.6
Technology and Equipment	38	4.6	3.2	-1.4	51	4.6	3.2	-1.4	57	4.5	3.3	-1.2

*Difference in satisfaction is statistically significant at least at the .05 level

APPENDICES 1, 2, AND 3

Appendix 1 shows the results of the summations of questions for each college functional area. The first Table (*Safety / Security / Campus Environment*) shows the type of employee responding – Classified, Faculty or Manager plus the summation (labeled "All Staff") in the first column. The next two columns show the number of individual survey responses received for both 1995 and 1999. The following two major columns show the average perceived "importance" level as determined by respondents for 1995 and 1999 plus the mean change (i.e., the simple subtraction of 1995 from 1999). The fourth major column (from left to right) shows the mean perceived level of "satisfaction" for 1995 and 1999 plus the mean change. The last set of columns show the performance gaps for 1995 and 1999 and the gap change (i.e., simple subtraction between 1995 and 1999). The remainder of the Tables of Appendix 1 is interpreted in a similar manner.

RESEARCH BRIEF (cont.)

Finally, note in any of the Tables of Appendix 1 that if a number is "**bold**" type, that indicates the difference in satisfaction is statistically significantly different than what would have been expected by chance—at least at the 0.05 level—i.e., only once (1) in twenty (20) survey sampling situations could such a result have occurred by chance.

Appendix 2 shows question-by-question responses for each *college functional area*. These Tables allow the reader to see exactly what each question asked and how each employee group responded to that question. Again, **bold** type indicates a statistically significant difference compared to what would be expected to occur by chance.

Appendix 3 includes the survey instrument used to collect the data for this report. The first 69 questions were administered to both staff and faculty. The remaining questions (70-113) were administered only to faculty.

APPENDIX 1

Detailed Analysis of Cuesta's Functional Areas

Appendix 1: College Functional Areas

SAFETY / SECURITY / CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	58	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.0	3.1	0.1
Faculty	148	79	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.0	3.1	0.1
Managers	26	10	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.3	3.5	0.2
All Staff	254	146	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.1	3.2	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.5	0.0
1.5	1.5	0.0
1.1	1.0	0.1
1.4	1.4	0.0

TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	72	62	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.1	3.4	0.3
Faculty	148	70	4.4	4.5	0.1	2.7	3.2	0.5
Managers	19	11	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.8	3.4	0.6
All Staff	239	143	4.4	4.5	0.1	2.8	3.3	0.5

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.4	1.2	0.2
1.7	1.3	0.4
1.7	1.1	0.6
1.6	1.2	0.4

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	85	70	4.4	4.4	0.0	2.9	3.2	0.3
Faculty	145	67	4.3	4.2	-0.1	2.8	3.2	0.4
Managers	20	12	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.6	3.4	-0.2
All Staff	250	149	4.3	4.3	0.0	2.9	3.2	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.2	0.3
1.5	1.0	0.5
0.8	1.1	-0.3
1.4	1.1	0.3

COLLEGE POLICIES

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	65	69	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	140	86	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.1	3.3	0.2
Managers	24	12	4.5	4.5	0.0	3.6	3.3	-0.3
All Staff	229	167	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.1	0.1
1.3	1.1	0.2
0.9	1.2	-0.3
1.2	1.1	0.1

FACULTY / STAFF EVALUATION

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	70	4.6	4.6	0.0	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	137	81	4.3	4.2	-0.1	3.6	3.4	-0.2
Managers	20	11	4.5	4.7	0.2	3.7	3.5	-0.2
All Staff	237	162	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.6	3.4	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.3	0.2
0.7	0.8	-0.1
0.8	1.2	-0.4
0.7	1.0	-0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 1: College Functional Areas (continued)

PLANNING / DECISION-MAKING

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	85	65	4.1	4.2	0.1	3.1	3.2	0.1
Faculty	134	94	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.0	3.1	0.1
Managers	23	12	4.2	4.3	0.1	3.5	3.5	0.0
All Staff	242	171	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.1	3.2	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.0	1.0	0.0
1.2	1.1	0.1
0.7	0.8	-0.1
1.1	1.0	0.1

COMMUNICATIONS / PUBLICATIONS

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	83	62	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.5	3.7	0.2
Faculty	143	85	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.3	3.4	0.1
Managers	25	12	4.6	4.6	0.0	3.9	3.7	-0.2
All Staff	251	159	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.4	3.5	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.0	0.9	0.1
1.1	1.0	0.1
0.7	0.9	-0.2
1.0	1.0	0.0

LIBRARY / LEARNING RESOURCES

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	85	65	4.3	4.6	0.3	3.7	3.6	-0.1
Faculty	135	84	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.3	3.4	0.1
Managers	24	12	4.2	4.1	-0.1	3.7	3.5	-0.2
All Staff	244	161	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.6	1.0	-0.4
0.9	0.8	0.1
0.5	0.6	-0.1
0.9	0.9	0.0

SUPPORT SERVICES

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	86	62	4.2	4.3	0.1	3.5	3.7	0.2
Faculty	140	90	4.1	4.2	0.1	3.7	3.7	0.0
Managers	24	11	4.1	4.4	0.3	3.6	3.8	0.2
All Staff	250	163	4.1	4.2	0.1	3.6	3.7	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.7	0.6	0.1
0.4	0.5	-0.1
0.5	0.6	-0.1
0.5	0.5	0.0

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	140	85	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.5	3.5	0.0
Managers								
All Staff	140	85	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.5	3.5	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.9	0.8	0.1
0.9	0.8	0.1

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

APPENDIX 2

Question by Question Analysis
Grouped by
Cuesta's Functional Areas

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

SAFETY / SECURITY / CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Question 11: Public Safety officers respond quickly in emergencies.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	71	4.7	4.6	-0.1	3.3	4.0	0.7
Faculty	146	102	4.5	4.5	0.0	3.3	3.6	0.3
Managers	26	14	4.6	4.5	-0.1	3.8	4.1	0.3
All Staff	252	187	4.6	4.6	0.0	3.4	3.8	0.4

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.4	0.6	0.8
1.2	0.9	0.3
0.8	0.4	0.4
1.2	0.8	0.4

Question 12: Parking lots are well lighted and secure.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	71	4.6	4.7	0.1	2.9	2.8	-0.1
Faculty	149	102	4.6	4.7	0.1	3.2	3.1	-0.1
Managers	26	13	4.7	4.2	-0.5	3.3	3.3	0.0
All Staff	256	186	4.6	4.7	0.1	3.1	3.0	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.7	1.9	-0.2
1.4	1.6	-0.2
1.4	0.9	0.5
1.5	1.7	-0.2

Question 13: The campus paths and buildings are safe and secure.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	70	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.5	3.7	0.2
Faculty	147	100	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.3	3.4	0.1
Managers	26	13	4.6	4.6	0.0	3.9	3.7	-0.2
All Staff	253	183	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.4	3.5	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.0	0.9	0.1
1.1	1.0	0.1
0.7	0.9	-0.2
1.0	1.0	0.0

Question 14: "Staff" parking space on campus is adequate.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	69	4.2	4.3	0.1	3.4	2.8	-0.6
Faculty	149	100	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.3	3.1	-0.2
Managers	25	14	3.9	4.2	0.3	4.0	3.2	-0.8
All Staff	255	183	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.4	3.0	-0.4

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.8	1.5	-0.7
1.0	1.3	-0.3
-0.1	1.0	-1.1
0.9	1.3	-0.4

Question 31: The classrooms and buildings are clean and satisfactorily maintained.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	63	4.3	4.5	0.2	2.7	3.2	0.5
Faculty	149	93	4.4	4.2	-0.2	2.6	2.8	0.2
Managers	26	12	4.2	4.3	0.1	2.8	3.5	0.7
All Staff	256	168	4.3	4.3	0.0	2.7	3.0	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.6	1.3	0.3
1.8	1.4	0.4
1.4	0.8	0.6
1.6	1.3	0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

Question 18: Staff and faculty access to computer technology (E-mail, INTERNET, research databases, and computer-assisted-instruction capabilities) is adequate.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	68	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.0	3.3	0.3
Faculty	147	97	4.2	4.3	0.1	2.1	3.4	1.3
Managers	26	14	4.4	4.3	-0.1	2.2	3.4	1.2
All Staff	254	179	4.3	4.4	0.1	2.4	3.4	1.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.1	0.4
2.1	0.9	1.2
2.2	0.9	1.3
1.9	1.0	0.9

Question 36: Instructional equipment -- overheads, televisions, monitors, and laboratory equipment -- is satisfactorily maintained.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	76	59	4.3	4.5	0.2	3.4	3.4	0.0
Faculty	150	91	4.6	4.3	-0.3	3.0	3.2	0.2
Managers	26	10	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.3	3.2	-0.1
All Staff	252	160	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.2	3.3	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.9	1.1	-0.2
1.6	1.1	0.5
1.2	1.2	0.0
1.3	1.1	0.2

Question 37: Non-instructional equipment -- copiers, computers -- is satisfactorily maintained.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	78	63	4.6	4.6	0.0	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	150	88	4.5	4.3	-0.2	2.9	3.1	0.2
Managers	25	10	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.0	3.3	0.3
All Staff	253	161	4.6	4.5	-0.1	3.0	3.2	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.3	0.2
1.6	1.2	0.4
1.5	1.3	0.2
1.6	1.3	0.3

Question 91: Computer Labs (such as the writing center, 6105; the math lab, 2602; the high tech center, 3154; the learning skills lab, 3153; the CIS lab, 4501, the Student Center and North County Computer labs) are adequate and accessible.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	144	60	4.3	4.5	0.2	2.7	3.2	0.5
Managers								
All Staff	144	60	4.3	4.5	0.2	2.7	3.2	0.5

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.6	1.3	0.3
1.6	1.3	0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Question 22: The college administration is structured and staffed to provide effective management.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	79	70	4.4	4.4	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0
Faculty	148	95	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.0	3.1	0.1
Managers	25	14	4.7	4.6	-0.1	3.5	3.3	-0.2
All Staff	252	179	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.5	0.0
1.2	1.1	0.1
1.2	1.3	-0.1
1.3	1.3	0.0

Question 23: The board responds to the needs of faculty and staff.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	68	4.5	4.4	-0.1	2.6	3.2	0.6
Faculty	146	96	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.5	3.1	0.6
Managers	26	14	4.3	4.5	0.2	3.5	2.8	-0.7
All Staff	252	178	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.6	3.1	0.5

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.9	1.2	0.7
2.0	1.4	0.6
0.8	1.7	-0.9
1.9	1.4	0.5

Question 25: Faculty and staff are appropriately involved in college governance through the committee structure.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	78	65	4.2	4.1	-0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	118	96	4.2	4.0	-0.2	3.1	3.0	-0.1
Managers	26	13	4.3	4.5	0.2	3.8	3.5	-0.3
All Staff	222	174	4.2	4.1	-0.1	3.2	3.2	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.1	0.8	0.3
1.1	1.0	0.1
0.5	1.0	-0.5
1.0	0.9	0.1

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

COLLEGE POLICIES

Question 15: College policies are effective.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	71	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	147	100	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.1	3.5	0.4
Managers	25	13	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.5	3.1	-0.4
All Staff	252	184	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.1	3.4	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.0	0.2
1.2	0.8	0.4
1.0	1.3	-0.3
1.2	0.9	0.3

Question 17: College policies are equitable.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	78	71	4.2	4.3	0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	143	96	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.1	3.2	0.1
Managers	25	11	4.6	4.5	-0.1	3.7	3.3	-0.4
All Staff	246	178	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.1	1.0	0.1
1.3	1.2	0.1
0.9	1.2	-0.3
1.2	1.1	0.1

Question 19: College policies are clearly defined.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	70	4.3	4.5	0.2	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	144	98	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.2	3.4	0.2
Managers	26	13	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.5	3.3	-0.2
All Staff	250	181	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.2	3.4	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.2	0.0
1.2	0.9	0.3
0.8	1.1	-0.3
1.1	1.0	0.1

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

FACULTY / STAFF EVALUATION

Question 32: The evaluation process for classified staff is fair.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	63	4.7	4.6	-0.1	2.9	3.2	0.3
Faculty	138	85	4.3	4.2	-0.1	3.3	3.2	-0.1
Managers	25	12	4.5	4.8	0.3	3.9	3.4	-0.5
All Staff	244	160	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.2	3.2	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.8	1.4	0.4
1.0	1.0	0.0
0.6	1.4	-0.8
1.3	1.2	0.1

Question 33: The evaluation process for classified staff is valuable.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	61	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.3	3.3	0.0
Faculty	139	90	4.3	4.0	-0.3	3.3	3.2	-0.1
Managers	26	12	4.5	4.7	0.2	3.5	3.3	-0.2
All Staff	245	163	4.3	4.2	-0.1	3.3	3.3	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.1	1.1	0.0
1.0	0.8	0.2
1.0	1.4	-0.4
1.0	0.9	0.1

Question 82: The peer-evaluation process for faculty is fair.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	147	55	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.7	3.4	-0.3
Managers								
All Staff	147	55	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.7	3.4	-0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.7	1.0	-0.3
0.7	1.0	-0.3

Question 83: The peer-evaluation process for faculty provides information to help faculty improve instruction.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	149	57	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.8	3.5	-0.3
Managers								
All Staff	149	57	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.8	3.5	-0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.8	-0.3
0.5	0.9	-0.4

Question 84: Student evaluations of instructors are helpful

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	150	64	4.1	4.3	0.2	3.8	3.7	-0.1
Managers								
All Staff	150	64	4.1	4.3	0.2	3.8	3.7	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.3	0.6	-0.3
0.3	0.6	-0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

PLANNING / DECISION-MAKING

Question 20: The college administration supports and utilizes a decision-making process that involves those who will be affected.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	70	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.8	2.8	0.0
Faculty	145	95	4.6	4.5	-0.1	2.8	3.1	0.3
Managers	26	13	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.7	3.3	-0.4
All Staff	251	178	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.9	3.0	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.7	1.7	0.0
1.8	1.4	0.4
0.7	1.0	-0.3
1.6	1.5	0.1

Question 21: The faculty and staff are sufficiently involved in developing the college plan through the Budget and Planning Committee.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	79	70	4.2	4.1	-0.1	3.0	3.4	0.4
Faculty	146	94	4.4	4.1	-0.3	3.1	3.1	0.0
Managers	26	14	4.3	3.6	-0.7	3.9	3.2	-0.7
All Staff	251	178	4.4	4.0	-0.4	3.1	3.2	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	0.7	0.5
1.3	1.0	0.3
0.4	0.4	0.0
1.3	0.8	0.5

Question 24: Faculty and Staff participate in the unit planning and understand its effect on their budgets.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	79	66	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.3	3.3	0.0
Faculty	148	95	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.4	3.3	-0.1
Managers	26	13	4.5	4.2	-0.3	3.4	3.3	-0.1
All Staff	253	174	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.3	3.3	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.0	1.0	0.0
1.0	1.0	0.0
1.1	0.9	0.2
1.1	1.0	0.1

Question 26: A timely decision making process is used by the college administration.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	69	4.3	4.3	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0
Faculty	147	93	4.3	4.2	-0.1	2.9	3.5	0.6
Managers	26	14	4.5	4.0	-0.5	3.4	3.4	0.0
All Staff	253	176	4.3	4.3	0.0	2.9	3.3	0.4

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.4	1.4	0.0
1.4	0.7	0.7
1.1	0.6	0.5
1.4	1.0	0.4

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

PLANNING / DECISION-MAKING (cont)

Question 29: Results of institutional research are provided to appropriate staff and faculty.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean	Mean Change		Mean	Mean Change	
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	69	3.7	3.8	0.1	3.2	3.2	0.0
Faculty	145	94	3.8	3.9	0.1	3.1	3.6	0.5
Managers	26	14	3.8	3.5	-0.3	3.4	3.5	0.1
All Staff	251	177	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.2	3.4	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap	Gap Change	
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.6	-0.1
0.7	0.3	0.4
0.4	0.0	0.4
0.6	0.4	0.2

Question 30: Institutional Research is conducted for use in institutional planning.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean	Mean Change		Mean	Mean Change	
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	74	66	3.5	3.7	0.2	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	142	94	3.7	3.9	0.2	2.9	2.9	0.0
Managers	26	11	3.7	3.9	0.2	3.1	3.4	0.3
All Staff	242	171	3.6	3.8	0.2	3.0	3.1	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap	Gap Change	
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.4	0.4	0.0
0.8	1.0	-0.2
0.6	0.5	0.1
0.6	0.7	-0.1

Question 87: The college provides research data needed for evaluation of student success (e.g., course completion, prerequisite preparation, accomplishment of personal goal, certificate, degree, preparation for transfer).

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean	Mean Change		Mean	Mean Change	
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	143	62	4.1	4.1	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0
Managers								
All Staff	143	62	4.1	4.1	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap	Gap Change	
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.2	0.0
1.2	1.2	0.0

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

COMMUNICATIONS / PUBLICATIONS

Question 27: The college president fosters effective communication between the governing board and college staff.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	78	67	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.1	3.3	0.2
Faculty	151	94	4.3	4.4	0.1	2.7	3.0	0.3
Managers	26	14	4.6	4.1	-0.5	3.9	3.3	-0.6
All Staff	255	175	4.4	4.4	0.0	2.9	3.1	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.3	1.2	0.1
1.6	1.4	0.2
0.7	0.8	-0.1
1.5	1.3	0.2

Question 28: The catalog and class schedules accurately represent Cuesta College.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	64	4.5	4.3	-0.2	3.8	4.1	0.3
Faculty	149	93	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.9	3.7	-0.2
Managers	26	14	4.5	4.1	-0.4	3.9	4.0	0.1
All Staff	256	171	4.5	4.3	-0.2	3.9	3.9	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.7	0.2	0.5
0.5	0.7	-0.2
0.6	0.1	0.5
0.6	0.4	0.2

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

LIBRARY / LEARNING RESOURCES

Question 34: The library is open when needed.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	62	4.2	4.5	0.3	3.7	3.4	-0.3
Faculty	151	90	4.4	4.2	-0.2	3.4	3.2	-0.2
Managers	25	11	4.2	4.0	-0.2	3.2	2.8	-0.4
All Staff	256	163	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.4	3.3	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	1.1	-0.6
1.0	1.0	0.0
1.0	1.2	-0.2
0.9	1.0	-0.1

Question 35: Library personnel are available and helpful.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	62	4.3	4.4	0.1	3.8	3.7	-0.1
Faculty	150	90	4.4	4.2	-0.2	4.1	3.8	-0.3
Managers	26	12	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.8	3.9	0.1
All Staff	256	164	4.3	4.3	0.0	4.0	3.8	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.7	-0.2
0.3	0.4	-0.1
0.4	0.3	0.1
0.3	0.5	-0.2

Question 88: The library has a sufficient and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials to meet the needs of students.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	145	59	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.0	3.1	0.1
Managers								
All Staff	145	59	4.5	4.4	-0.1	3.0	3.1	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.3	0.2
1.5	1.3	0.2

Question 89: The library has an adequate and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials for faculty needs.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	142	63	4.2	4.3	0.1	2.9	2.9	0.0
Managers								
All Staff	142	63	4.2	4.3	0.1	2.9	2.9	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.3	1.4	-0.1
1.3	1.4	-0.1

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

LIBRARY / LEARNING RESOURCES (cont)

**Question 90: Your students are required to use the library's electronic learning resources--
EbscoHost (Periodical Database); WebCat; Social Issues Resource Series (SIRS); (INFOTRAC);
New York Times--text; Los Angeles Times--text; and INTERNET.**

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	137	59	3.5	4.2	0.7	3.0	3.3	0.3
Managers								
All Staff	137	59	3.5	4.1	0.6	3.0	3.3	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.9	-0.4
0.5	0.8	-0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

SUPPORT SERVICES

Question 10: Adequate child care facilities are available on campus.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	72	3.5	3.6	0.1	3.0	3.2	0.2
Faculty	141	102	3.5	3.8	0.3	3.1	3.3	0.2
Managers	26	14	3.6	3.6	0.0	2.8	3.6	0.8
All Staff	248	188	3.5	3.7	0.2	3.1	3.3	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.4	0.1
0.4	0.5	-0.1
0.8	0.0	0.8
0.4	0.4	0.0

Question 16: The campus demonstrates a commitment to meeting the access needs of students with disabilities.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	81	71	4.2	4.4	0.2	3.6	3.8	0.2
Faculty	146	98	4.1	4.4	0.3	3.8	3.7	-0.1
Managers	26	13	4.3	4.5	0.2	4.0	4.1	0.1
All Staff	253	182	4.2	4.4	0.2	3.8	3.8	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.6	0.6	0.0
0.3	0.7	-0.4
0.3	0.4	-0.1
0.4	0.6	-0.2

Question 38: The bookstore provides adequate service in support of instruction.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	80	62	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.7	3.9	0.2
Faculty	148	88	4.3	4.0	-0.3	3.8	3.9	0.1
Managers	24	11	4.2	4.3	0.1	3.9	3.4	-0.5
All Staff	252	161	4.3	4.2	-0.1	3.8	3.9	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.6	0.4	0.2
0.5	0.1	0.4
0.3	0.9	-0.6
0.5	0.3	0.2

Question 39: The Admissions and Records office provides prompt and efficient service.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified	79	66	4.7	4.7	0.0	3.6	4.0	0.4
Faculty	147	90	4.3	4.1	-0.2	3.9	3.9	0.0
Managers	25	12	4.3	4.6	0.3	3.7	4.1	0.4
All Staff	251	168	4.4	4.3	-0.1	3.8	3.9	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.1	0.7	0.4
0.4	0.2	0.2
0.6	0.5	0.1
0.6	0.4	0.2

Question 76: The Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) enhances access to the educational process.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	146	59	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.0	3.8	-0.2
Managers								
All Staff	146	59	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.0	3.8	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.2	0.4	-0.2
0.2	0.4	-0.2

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

SUPPORT SERVICES (cont)

Question 80: Adequate Tutorial Services are available.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	148	62	4.2	4.5	0.3	3.4	3.3	-0.1
Managers								
All Staff	148	62	4.2	4.5	0.3	3.4	3.3	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.8	1.2	-0.4
0.8	1.2	-0.4

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Question 70: Cuesta College supports academic freedom.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	148	64	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.7	3.8	0.1
Managers								
All Staff	148	64	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.7	3.8	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.8	0.8	0.0
0.8	0.8	0.0

Question 71: The typical "A" grade received by Cuesta students accurately reflects excellence.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	146	66	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.3	3.6	0.3
Managers								
All Staff	146	66	4.5	4.6	0.1	3.3	3.6	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.0	0.2
1.2	1.0	0.2

Question 72: Course outlines clearly specify the subject matter to be covered and skills to be acquired by students.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	150	64	4.4	4.4	0.0	3.8	4.0	0.2
Managers								
All Staff	150	64	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.8	3.9	0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.6	0.4	0.2
0.6	0.6	0.0

Question 73: Counseling and academic advisement services consistently assist student in making appropriate decisions.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	148	61	4.4	4.6	0.2	3.2	3.2	0.0
Managers								
All Staff	148	61	4.4	4.6	0.2	3.2	3.1	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.2	1.4	-0.2
1.2	1.5	-0.3

Question 74: Curricula are regularly reviewed to ensure that instructional programs meet the needs of prospective employers.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	148	67	4.1	4.3	0.2	3.2	3.5	0.3
Managers								
All Staff	148	67	4.1	4.3	0.2	3.2	3.5	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.9	0.8	0.1
0.9	0.8	0.1

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (cont)

Question 75: The faculty is sufficiently involved in decisions concerning general education requirements.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	147	63	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0
Managers								
All Staff	147	63	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.9	0.9	0.0
0.9	0.9	0.0

Question 77: Curriculum development considers the articulation process.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	139	62	4.1	4.2	0.1	3.7	3.5	-0.2
Managers								
All Staff	139	62	4.1	4.2	0.1	3.7	3.5	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.4	0.7	-0.3
0.4	0.7	-0.3

Question 78: Instructors at Cuesta College are fair and objective in their presentation of course material.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	147	59	4.6	4.7	0.1	4.0	3.8	-0.2
Managers								
All Staff	147	59	4.6	4.7	0.1	4.0	3.8	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.6	0.9	-0.3
0.6	0.9	-0.3

Question 79: Course Syllabi provide course requirements and grading criteria to students.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	148	63	4.5	4.6	0.1	4.0	3.9	-0.1
Managers								
All Staff	148	63	4.5	4.6	0.1	4.0	3.9	-0.1

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.5	0.7	-0.2
0.5	0.7	-0.2

Question 81: Program Review is effective in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	144	60	4.1	4.1	0.0	3.1	3.3	0.2
Managers								
All Staff	144	60	4.1	4.1	0.0	3.1	3.4	0.3

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.0	0.8	0.2
1.0	0.7	0.3

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

Appendix 2: Question by Question Responses Grouped by College Functional Area**INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (con.)**

Question 85: The college provides adequate data for faculty to participate in program review (i.e., transfer, retention and graduation rates).

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	143	63	4.0	3.9	-0.1	3.2	3.0	-0.2
Managers								
All Staff	143	63	4.0	3.9	-0.1	3.2	3.0	-0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
0.8	0.9	-0.1
0.8	0.9	-0.1

Question 86: The college provides adequate information (e.g., relevant data and timely communication) for faculty who are involved in possible program elimination.

Employee Category	Number of Responses		Importance			Satisfaction		
			Mean		Mean Change	Mean		Mean Change
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1999-1995	1995	1999	1999-1995
Classified								
Faculty	138	61	4.4	4.2	-0.2	2.9	3.1	0.2
Managers								
All Staff	138	61	4.4	4.2	-0.2	2.9	3.1	0.2

Performance Gap		
Gap		Gap Change
1995	1999	1999-1995
1.5	1.1	0.4
1.5	1.1	0.4

Bold, italicized numbers indicate that the difference in "Satisfaction" between 1995 and 1999 is statistically significant at the .05 level

APPENDIX 3

Scannable Survey Instrument

CUESTA COLLEGE FACULTY AND STAFF SURVEY (Spring 1999)

Not Important at all
 Neutral / No Opinion
 Unimportant
 Important
 Very Important

For items 10-39, please rate the IMPORTANCE of each item.

■ 10. Adequate child care facilities are available on campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 11. Public Safety officers respond quickly in emergencies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 12. Parking lots are well lighted and secure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 13. The campus paths and buildings are safe and secure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 14. "Staff" parking space on campus is adequate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 15. College policies are effective.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 16. The campus demonstrates a commitment to meeting the access needs of students with disabilities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 17. College policies are equitable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 18. Staff and faculty access to computer technology (E-mail, INTERNET, research databases, and computer-assisted-instruction capabilities) is adequate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 19. College policies are clearly defined.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 20. The college administration supports and utilizes a decision-making process that involves those who will be affected.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 21. The faculty and staff are sufficiently involved in developing the college plan through the Budget and Planning Committee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 22. The college administration is structured and staffed to provide effective management.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 23. The board responds to the needs of faculty and staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 24. Faculty and Staff participate in the unit planning and understand its effect on their budgets.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 25. Faculty and staff are appropriately involved in college governance through the committee structure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 26. A timely decision making process is used by the college administration.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 27. The college president fosters effective communication between the governing board and college staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 28. The catalog and class schedules accurately represent Cuesta College.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 29. Results of institutional research are provided to appropriate staff and faculty.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 30. Institutional Research is conducted for use in institutional planning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 31. The classrooms and buildings are clean and satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 32. The evaluation process for classified staff is fair.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 33. The evaluation process for classified staff is valuable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 34. The library is open when needed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 35. Library personnel are available and helpful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 36. Instructional equipment -- overheads, television monitors, and laboratory equipment -- is satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 37. Non-instructional equipment -- copiers, computers -- is satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 38. The bookstore provides adequate service in support of instruction.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
■ 39. The Admissions and Records office provides prompt and efficient service.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

****PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK SIDE****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Neutral / No Opinion
Unsatisfied
Very Satisfied
Not Satisfied at all

For Items 40-69 please rate your current level of SATISFACTION with each item

40. Adequate child care facilities are available on campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
41. Public Safety officers respond quickly to emergencies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
42. Parking lots are well lighted and secure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
43. The campus paths and buildings are safe and secure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
44. "Staff" parking space on campus is adequate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
45. College policies are effective.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
46. The campus demonstrates a commitment to meeting the needs of students with disabilities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
47. College policies are equitable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
48. Staff and faculty access to computer technology (E-mail, INTERNET, research databases, and computer-assisted-instruction capabilities) is adequate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
49. College policies are clearly defined.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
50. The college administration supports and utilizes a decision-making process that involves those who will be affected.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
51. The faculty and staff are sufficiently involved in developing the college plan through the Budget and Planning Committee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
52. The college administration is structured and staffed to provide effective management.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
53. The board responds to the needs of faculty and staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
54. Faculty and staff participate in the unit planning and understand its effect on their budgets.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
55. Faculty and staff are appropriately involved in college governance through the committee structure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
56. A timely decision making process is used by the college administration.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
57. The college president fosters effective communication between the governing board and college staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
58. The catalog and class schedules accurately represent Cuesta College.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
59. Results of institutional research are provided to appropriate staff and faculty.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
60. Institutional Research is conducted for use in institutional planning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
61. The classrooms and buildings are clean and satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
62. The evaluation process for classified staff is fair.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
63. The evaluation process for classified staff is valuable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
64. The library is open when needed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
65. Library personnel are available and helpful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
66. Instructional equipment -- overheads, televisions monitors, and laboratory equipment -- is satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
67. Non-instructional equipment -- copiers, computers -- is satisfactorily maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
68. The bookstore provides adequate service in support of instruction.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
69. The Admissions and Records office provides prompt and efficient service.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

****PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Not Important at all Neutral / No Opinion Unimportant Important Very Important

For items 70-91, please rate the IMPORTANCE of each item.

70. Cuesta College supports academic freedom.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
71. The typical "A" grade received by Cuesta students accurately reflects excellence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72. Course outlines clearly specify the subject matter to be covered and skills to be acquired by students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
73. Counseling and academic advisement services consistently assist student in making appropriate decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
74. Curricula are regularly reviewed to ensure that instructional programs meet the needs of prospective employers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
75. The faculty is sufficiently involved in decisions concerning general education requirements.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
76. The Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) enhances access to the educational process.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
77. Curriculum development considers the articulation process.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
78. Instructors at Cuesta College are fair and objective in their presentation of course material.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
79. Course Syllabi provide course requirements and grading criteria to students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
80. Adequate Tutorial Services are available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
81. Program Review is effective in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
82. The peer-evaluation process for faculty is fair.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
83. The peer-evaluation process for faculty provides information to help faculty improve instruction.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
84. Student evaluations of instructors are helpful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
85. The college provides adequate data for faculty to participate in program review (i.e., transfer, retention and graduation rates).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
86. The college provides adequate information (e.g., relevant data and timely communication) for faculty who are involved in possible program elimination.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
87. The college provides research data needed for evaluation of student success (e.g., course completion, prerequisite preparation, accomplishment of personal goal, certificate, degree, preparation for transfer).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
88. The library has a sufficient and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials to meet the needs of students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
89. The library has an adequate and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials for faculty needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
90. Your students are required to use the library's electronic learning resources--EbscoHost (Periodical Database); WebCat; Social Issues Resource Series (SIRS); (INFOTRAC); New York Times--text; Los Angeles Times--text; and INTERNET.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
91. Computer Labs (such as the writing center, 6105; the math lab, 2602; the high tech center, 3154; the learning skills lab, 3153; the CIS lab, 4501, the Student Center and North County Computer labs) are adequate and accessible.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK SIDE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For Items 92-113 please rate your current level of SATISFACTION with each item

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 92. | Cuesta College supports academic freedom. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 93. | The typical "A" grade received by Cuesta students accurately reflects excellence. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 94. | Course outlines clearly specify the subject matter to be covered and skills to be acquired by students. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 95. | Counseling and academic advisement services consistently assist student in making appropriate decisions. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 96. | Curricula are regularly reviewed to ensure that instructional programs meet the needs of prospective employers. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 97. | The faculty is sufficiently involved in decisions concerning general education requirements. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 98. | The Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) enhances access to the educational process. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 99. | Curriculum development considers the articulation process. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 100. | Instructors at Cuesta College are fair and objective in their presentation of course material. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 101. | Course Syllabi provide course requirements and grading criteria to students. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 102. | Adequate Tutorial Services are available. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 103. | Program Review is effective in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 104. | The peer-evaluation process for faculty is fair. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 105. | The peer-evaluation process for faculty provides information to help faculty improve instruction. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 106. | Student evaluations of instructors are helpful. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 107. | The college provides adequate data for faculty to participate in program review (i.e., transfer, retention and graduation rates). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 108. | The college provides adequate information (e.g., relevant data and timely communication) for faculty who are involved in possible program elimination. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 109. | The college provides research data needed for evaluation of student success (e.g., course completion, prerequisite preparation, accomplishment of personal goal, certificate, degree, preparation for transfer). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 110. | The library has a sufficient and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials to meet the needs of students. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 111. | The library has an adequate and up-to-date selection of books, periodicals, and resource materials for faculty needs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 112. | Your students are required to use the library's electronic learning resources—Ebscohost (Periodical Database); WebCat; Social Issues Resource Series (SIRS); (INFOTRAC); New York Times--text; Los Angeles Times--text; and INTERNET. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 113. | Computer Labs (such as the writing center, 6105; the math lab, 2602; the high tech center, 3154; the learning skills lab, 3153; the CIS lab, 4501; the Student Center and North County Computer labs) are adequate and accessible. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INPUT!

Demographics

Please bubble-in your responses using a number 2 pencil or a dark ink pen.

1. Gender

☐ Female

☐ Male

2. Ethnicity

☐ American Indian

☐ Filipino

☐ Other

☐ Asian / Pacific Islander

☐ Hispanic

☐ Undeclared

☐ Black

☐ White

3. How long have you been employed by Cuesta College?

☐ Less than one year

☐ 3.1 to 5 years

☐ Greater than 10 years

☐ 1 year to 3 years

☐ 5.1 to 10 years

4. In which Division do you work (if you don't find your division here, refer to question 5)?

☐ Administrative Services

☐ English

☐ Instructional Services

☐ Biological Sciences

☐ Fine Arts

☐ Language/Communication

☐ Business Education

☐ Human Development

☐ Engineer/ Elect / Crim Jus

☐ Humanities

5. Divisions Continued:

☐ Library/Learning Resource

☐ Physical Education

☐ Welding/Auto/Construction

☐ Mathematics

☐ Physical Sciences

☐ Other

☐ Nursing/Allied Health

☐ Social Sciences

☐ Performing Arts

☐ Student Services

6. What is your work status?

☐ Full-time

☐ Part-time

7. When do you do most of your work for Cuesta?

☐ Day

☐ Evening

8. Where is the majority of your assignment conducted?

☐ San Luis Campus

☐ North County Campus

☐ South County Site

9. Employee Category:

☐ Classified Staff

☐ Division Chair

☐ Manager / Supv. / Adm.

☐ Confidential

☐ Faculty

****PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE****